

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PATRICIA ATKINSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 GENEVA LANGWORTHY,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C20-95 MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

15
16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court upon Defendant Geneva Langworthy's Motion
17 for Reconsideration. (Dkt. No. 8.) Having reviewed the Motion, the Complaint, and the
18 remaining record, the Court DENIES the Motion.¹

19 This matter was removed from the Whatcom County District Court on January 20, 2020
20 shortly before a hearing was scheduled in that court on Plaintiff's petition for a protective order
21 against the defendant. (Dkt. No. 1.) Plaintiff's petition alleges that Defendant was harassing her
22


23
24 ¹ The Court has not reviewed Plaintiff's Response to the Motion (Dkt. No. 9) because it was not filed in accordance
with Local Rule 7(h)(3).

1 by yelling loudly outside her home and “protesting” at her business offices and events. (Dkt. No.
2 1, Ex. 2.) On January 22, 2020, this Court granted Plaintiff’s Emergency Motion to Remand
3 (Dkt. No. 6), finding it lacks jurisdiction in this matter because the Parties are not diverse, and
4 the petition alleges no federal causes of action. (Dkt. No. 7.)

5 Plaintiff now moves for reconsideration, arguing that the Court erred because the
6 Complaint alleges Defendant was “protesting” outside Plaintiff’s house, implying a federal cause
7 of action under the First Amendment. (Dkt. No. 8 at 1-7.) Motions for reconsideration are
8 disfavored and ordinarily will not be granted “in the absence of a showing of manifest error in
9 the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought
10 to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). Defendant has failed to make
11 such a showing. As the Court explained in its Order, the Complaint does not contain a First
12 Amendment claim and Defendant’s intent to “counter-sue for denial of free speech and free
13 expression” does not establish federal jurisdiction. (See Dkt. No. 7 at 2.) Here, Defendant
14 merely attempts to relitigate the merits of the Motion to Remand. This is improper and does not
15 constitute grounds for reconsideration. The Motion is therefore DENIED.

16
17 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Defendant and all counsel.

18 Dated February 21, 2020.

19 
20 Barbara J. Rothstein
21 Senior United States District Judge
22
23
24